



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,565	07/30/2003	Min-Ho Seo	P24001	6472

7055 7590 11/28/2005

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE  
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

SCHLIE, PAUL W

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2186

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/629,565	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SEO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Paul W. Schlie	<b>Art Unit</b> 2186	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Amended claims 1-22 have been examined.

#### ***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

As the word "command" is misspelled as "commend" on at least line 28 of page 3 of the disclosure, and likely elsewhere.

3. Claims 1-3, are objected to because of the following informalities:

As within claims 1-2, the word "command" is misspelled as "commend" within at least these claims and likely elsewhere.

As within claim 3 on line 9 of page 5, "and decoding the input ..." should likely read as "and encoding the input ...", and will be assumed to be as such.

4. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification. Corrective action is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claim 1, 5, 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yokota et al. (EP 1,081,699 A1).

As per claim 1, 5 13 and 16, Yokota teaches a media processing device comprising: a signal sourcing and output module (figure 3 items 53-56), a signal processing module (figure 3 item 49), a storage device access module which interconnects to a storage device through some certain transmission medium (figure 3 items 42-43), a user interface module (figure 3 items 21, 30, and 45), a system controller module including corresponding system program and data memory modules (figure 3 item 41/48); whereby upon the receipt of a command from the user interface module, a signal sourced from the signal sourcing module may be encoded by a second signal processing method by the signal processing module, and subsequently stored as a media file on an external storage device accessed through the storage device access module when accessible; and correspondingly, signals encoded and stored as media files on an external storage device accessed through the storage access module, whose information (such as directory structure, thereby deemed inherent) may be copied to system memory and displayed by the user interface module, where upon a command to decode one or more media files, the previously stored encoded signal data is copied to the system data memory module and correspondingly sourced to the signal processing module, which decodes the previously encoded data utilizing a first signal processing method and forwards the resulting signal to the signal output module.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2186

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 2 and 14-<sup>15</sup>~~5~~ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokota et al. (EP 1,081,699 A1) in further view of Birrell et al. (6,332,175).

As per claim 2 and 14-15, being dependent on claim 1 or 5 respectively, where Yokota et al. further teaches that power may be saved by inactivating non-presently required modules (figure 4 and column 20 lines 1-14), but does not explicitly teach that the storage device interface module may be inactivated when access to a correspondingly interconnected storage device is not presently necessary, nor that read data may be read from an external lower priority accessed storage device and buffered in system memory prior to its requirement, so that the storage device may be inactivated to save power. However, Birrell et al. teaches that a lower priority accessed external storage device may have its data copied to a local memory from where it will be subsequently accessed, thereby enabling the external storage device to be inactivated to save power (figure 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to recognize that any module may be inactivated through similar means if determined to be measurably beneficial for the purpose of saving power and therefore battery life.

9. Claim 3-4, 6 and 9, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokota et al. (EP 1,081,699 A1) in further view of Shimada (U.S. App. 2002/0154900).

As per claim 3, taught by Yokota et al. as per claim 1 above, or per claims 4, 6 and 9 being dependent on claim 3, but Yokota et al. does not teach that an external

Art Unit: 2186

storage device may contain bootstrap program code, which upon being read may control the subsequent behavior of a media processing device. However in view of the fact that most computing devices which support external storage devices enable the machine to bootstrap themselves from such devices, and that Shimada further teaches more specifically that such a media processing device may bootstrap itself with the program code stored within external storage devices which controls the processing of media file encoding, decoding and/or recording/playback (figure 11 element 80); it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify that taught by Yokota, to enable a media processing device to bootstrap itself with specific program code contained within an external storage device, copy file information into system memory for subsequent use, and/or to duplicate code onto other storage devices as may be desired, for the benefit of being able to define and/or configure the functionality and/or capabilities of a media processing device as a function of the program and/or data content stored on an external storage device.

10. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokota et al. (EP 1,081,699 A1) and Shimada (U.S. App. 2002/0154900) in further view of Birrell et al. (6,332,175).

As per claims 7-8, being dependent on claim 3, where neither Yokota et al, nor Shimada teach that a storage device access module may inactivated to reduce the system's power consumption when not presently required to be activated. However Birrell et al. teaches this (as outlined for claim 2 above), and further that the process of copying previously encoded data from an external storage device is of lower priority

than that of the operation of decoding said encoded data (figure 3). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to recognize that any module may be inactivated through similar means if determined to be measurably beneficial for the purpose of saving power and therefore battery life.

11. Claim 10-12 and 17-22, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokota et al. (EP 1,081,699 A1) and Shimada (U.S. App. 2002/0154900).


As per claims 10-12 and 17-22, being dependant on claims 1, 3, or 5; Yokota further teaches that an arbitrary standard communication medium and/or protocol may be utilized to access external storage and/or control (column 5 lines 53-56, and column 6 lines 8-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize various forms of standardized USB, IEEE 1394, and/or wireless access means and/or protocols, for the benefit of satisfying various commercial market interface requirements as may be desired.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul W. Schlie whose telephone number is 571-272-6765. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 8:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Kim can be reached on 517-272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2186

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



PIERRE BATAILLE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER